

Dear Sir/Madam

I believe the FCC should not implement any proposal that would lessen Indiana's Telephone Privacy law protections. Although in some cases, this may be a interstate commerce issue, giving these companies the right to infringe on the privacy of individuals who have chosen not to be solicited is placing their business needs before our right to privacy. Why should I have to pay for a call screening service to eliminate calls that shouldn't be allowed in the first place. These companies can advertise by mail, print or television already, why give them the right to disturb me at home when all I have to do is pick up the phone and call them if I need their service. I disagree with any proposal that would eliminate the protection Indiana's "Do Not Call" list has provided.

Indiana's Telephone Privacy law has completely eliminated the solicitor calls we receive of an evening. Now, when we sit down to dinner as a family, we can enjoy our dinner in peace and when the phone does occassionally ring it's usually my wife's family. Prior to Indiana's new law, our dinner was interrupted nightly by someone wanting to sell me a credit card or who wanted a donation for some obscure cause. Again, I would prefer to instigate the contact if I need credit and I will choose the not-for-profit organizations I choose to support.

Overall, I can fairly state that Indiana's law has given my family back our privacy. We now have control over who will be calling us. There are enough open lines of communication into my home that these companies can utilize (TV, radio, internet, newspapers, magazine, direct mail), why give them access to one more, especially one I can't easily control. At least with the other methods I can decide to turn them off or not receive/read them. The telephone is an important line of communication for American citizens and to give solicitors this access is to minimize it's value to us all. We will all be forced to turn to caller ID or call blocking on a personal basis to protect our privacy. As I said earlier, these are expensive tools and shouldn't be necessary when laws are in place that make it the solicitors responsibility not to disturb the privacy of those who do not want their product.

I thank you for your time and attention. Please consider this information in making your decision to limit the State's right to protect it's citizens.

Best Regards,  
Raymond K. Irvin